

REMARKS

In response to the Examiner's objection to the drawings, Applicant finds that claims 2 and 12 incorrectly referred to "the back panel" when in fact these claims should have referred to --the front panel--. Note that a line of perforations 30 at or adjacent the fold line 26 and in the sealing flap 14 on in the front panel (hidden from view) is shown in FIG. 1. A similar line of perforation 64 at fold line 62 is shown in FIG. 3.

Since a line of perforations 30 or 64 is shown in FIGS. 1 and 3 at or adjacent a fold line 26 or 62 and in a sealing flap 14 or 56 or in a front panel (hidden from view) no drawing correction is required to show a line of perforations in the back panel. Furthermore, claims 2 and 12 objected to by the Examiner have been cancelled and the specification is being amended to be consistent with the drawings and the claims.

The Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 13 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for being anticipated by the Will U.S. Patent No. 1,957,684, as this rejection may be attempted to be applied against the amended claims 1, 2, 11, 13 and 22 is respectfully traversed.

It support of this traverse it is noted that Will shows a line of perforations 11 which extends in the ceiling flap transverse to the fold line 12 and in line of perforations 11 which extends in a corner area only. Nowhere is there disclosed or suggested in Will a line of perforations at or adjacent the fold line 12 in the ceiling flap 13 or in the front panel or body 5 and extending parallel to a strip of adhesive from the corner area to a free side edge of the envelope opposite the corner area.

Note that claims 1 and 11 have been amended to call for a line of perforations at the fold line and in the front panel or the sealing flap and extending parallel to a strip of adhesive from a corner section to a free side edge of the envelope opposite the corner section. Again no such structure is shown or disclosed in Will.

The Examiner's rejections of claims 1, 3, 11, 13, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being unpatentable over the Snider U.S. Patent No. 1,044,935 and the Sung et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,570, 835, as this rejection may be attempted to be applied against the amended claims, is respectfully traversed.

While Snider shows two weakened lines 15, 16 which are spaced from each other and extend transversely of the ceiling flap to weakened lines 17 and 18 which extend from the rupturing tongue 10 formed between the weakened lines 15 and 16 to respective side edges of the envelope at or along a fold line, such structure does not teach or suggest a sealing flap or front panel having a line of perforations at or adjacent a fold line and extending parallel to a strip of adhesive from a corner section to a free side edge of the envelope opposite the corner section as now called for even more clearly in amended claims 1 and 11.

While Sung et al. discloses legends on different portions of an envelope, Sung et al. does not disclose or suggest Applicant's specific line of perforations at or adjacent a fold line.

The Examiner's rejection of claim 1, 3, 11, 13, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being unpatentable over the O'Connor Canadian patent no. 636,634, as this rejection may be attempted to be applied to the amended claims, is respectfully traversed.

While the Canadian patent shows a corner section or area 17 and a line of perforations 25 traverse to a sealing flap or closure flap 14, it does not teach or suggest a line of perforations extending from the corner section 17 at or adjacent a fold line 24 and in the closure flap 14 or adjacent panel 10 of the envelope.

The allowance of claims 4-10 is noted.


Claim 14 has been amended into independent form so that the objected to claims 14-20 are now rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, these claims are now in condition for allowance.

In summary, Applicant submits that the references cited by the Examiner do not teach a sealing flap or front panel having a line of perforations at or adjacent a fold line extending parallel to the strip of adhesive from a corner section to a free side edge of the envelope opposite the corner section as now called for in amended claims 1 and 11.

For this reason, Applicant submits that all the claims are in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that end is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

WELSH & KATZ, LTD.

By: 
Thomas R. Vigil
Reg. No. 24,542
Attorney for Applicant

Dated: March 2, 2006

120 South Riverside Plaza, 22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606-3912
Tel: 312-655-1500
Fax: 312-655-1501